

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
P.O. BOX 1450
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1400

JJGJR.: 09-04

Paper No: 16

FISH & RICHARDSON, PC 12390 EL CAMINO REAL SAN DIEGO CA 92130-2081

COPY MAILED

SEP 1 0 2004

In re Application of Castiel, et al
Application No. 09/658 2

OFFICE OF PETITIONS

Application No. 09/658,215 Filed: 8 September, 2000

ON PETITION

Attorney Docket No.: 10636-005001

This is a decision on the materials considered as a petition filed on 22 July and supplemented on 19 August, 2004, seeking to revive the instant application under 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b) as having been abandoned due to unintentional delay.

For the reasons set forth below, the petition is **DISMISSED**.

NOTES:

- (1) Any petition (and fee) for reconsideration of this decision under 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b) (as to unintentional delay) <u>must</u> be submitted within <u>two</u> (2) <u>months</u> from the mail date of this decision. Extensions of time under 37 C.F.R. §1.136(a) are permitted. The reconsideration request should include a cover letter entitled "Renewed Petition under 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b)";
- (2) Thereafter, there will be no further reconsideration of this matter.

BACKGROUND

The record reflects that:

• the Office mailed a Notice of Missing Parts on 27 October, 2000, and the 6 March, 2001, and 20 September, 2001, petitions seeking status under 37 C.F.R. §1.47 were dismissed by the Office on 9 July, 2001, and 2 October, 2001, respectively;

- although Petitioner failed to timely and properly address the dismissal of 2 October, 2001, on or before Monday, 3 December, 2001—and thus the application was deemed abandoned after midnight 2 December, 2001—the Examiner nonetheless examined the application and mailed a Notice of Allowance on 7 October, 2003;
- during review prior to publication, the abandoned status of the application was discovered by the Office.
- a Communication was mailed by the Office to Petitioner on 21 May, 2004, and indicated that Petitioner had failed to reply timely and properly to the dismissal of 2 October, 2001;
- nonetheless, the 21 May, 2004, petition was dismissed on 16 June, 2004, after Petitioner argued as to some unidentified paper <u>dated 1 September, 2000</u> (sic)—a date which is not at issue in this regard, and failed to reply properly to the 2 October, 2001;
- after Petitioner submitted via FAX on 26 July, 2004, some copies of transmittal documents, he filed the instant petition on 19 August, 2004, and even after an attorney from the Office of Petitions reminded Petitioner of the reply requirement in a telephone conference of 9 September, 2004, Petitioner failed to supplement his petition with the required reply–i.e., a grantable petition under 37 C.F.R. §1.47 or a petition evidencing joinder.

Thus, Petitioner has filed a petition (with fee), and made the statement of unintentional delay, however, he has failed to satisfy the reply requirement of the regulation.

STATUTES, REGULATIONS AND ANALYSIS

Congress has authorized the Commissioner to "revive an application if the delay is shown to the satisfaction of the Commissioner to have been "unavoidable." 35 U.S.C. §133 (1994).

The regulations at 37 C.F.R. §1.137(a) and (b) set forth the requirements for a petitioner to revive a previously unavoidably or unintentionally, respectively, abandoned application under this congressional grant of authority. The language of 35 U.S.C. §133 and 37 C.F.R. §1.137(a) is clear, unambiguous, and without qualification: the delay in tendering the reply to the outstanding Office action, as well as filing the first petition seeking revival, must have been unavoidable for

¹ 35 U.S.C. §133 provides:

³⁵ U.S.C. §133 Time for prosecuting application.

Upon failure of the applicant to prosecute the application within six months after any action therein, of which notice has been given or mailed to the applicant, or within such shorter time, not less than thirty days, as fixed by the Commissioner in such action, the application shall be regarded as abandoned by the parties thereto, unless it be shown to the satisfaction of the Commissioner that such delay was unavoidable.

the reply now to be accepted on petition.²

Delays in responding properly raise the question whether delays are unavoidable.³ Where there is a question whether the delay was unavoidable, Petitioners must meet the burden of establishing that the delay was unavoidable within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §133 and 37 C.F.R. §1.137(a).⁴ And the Petitioner must be diligent in attending to the matter.⁵ Failure to do so does not constitute the care required under <u>Pratt</u>, and so cannot satisfy the test for diligence and due care.

By contrast, <u>unintentional</u> delays are those that do not satisfy the very strict statutory and regulatory requirements of unavoidable delay, <u>and</u> also, by definition, are not intentional.⁶ And petitions calling upon the authority of the Commissioner to act, such as that under 37 C.F.R. §1.181,⁷ require diligence as to their filing—i.e., the petition must be filed within two months of

§ 1.181 Petition to the Commissioner.

Therefore, by example, an <u>unavoidable</u> delay in the payment of the Filing Fee might occur if a reply is shipped by the US Postal Service, but due to catastrophic accident, the delivery is not made.

³ See: Changes to Patent Practice and Procedure; Final Rule Notice, 62 Fed. Reg. at 53158-59 (October 10, 1997), 1203 Off. Gaz. Pat. Office at 86-87 (October 21, 1997).

See: In re Application of G, 11 USPQ2d 1378, 1380 (Comm'r Pats. 1989).

⁵ See: Diligence in Filing Petitions to Revive and Petitions to Withdraw the Holding of Abandonment, 1124 Off. Gaz. Pat. Office 33 (March 19, 1991). It was and is Petitioner's burden to exercise diligence in seeking either to have the holding of abandonment withdrawn or the application revived. See 1124 Off. Gaz. Pat. Office supra.

Therefore, by example, an <u>unintentional</u> delay in the reply might occur if the reply and transmittal form are <u>to be</u> prepared for shipment by the US Postal Service, but other pressing matters distract one's attention and the mail is not timely deposited for shipment.

The regulations at 37 C.F.R. §1.181 provide:

⁽a) Petition may be taken to the Commissioner:

⁽¹⁾ From any action or requirement of any examiner in the *ex parte* prosecution of an application, or in the *ex parte* or *inter partes* prosecution of a reexamination proceeding which is not subject to appeal to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences or to the court;

⁽²⁾ In cases in which a statute or the rules specify that the matter is to be determined directly by orreviewed by the Commissioner; and

⁽³⁾ To invoke the supervisory authority of the Commissioner in appropriate circumstances. For petitions in interferences, see § 1.644.

⁽b) Any such petition must contain a statement of the facts involved and the point or points to be reviewed and the action requested. Briefs or memoranda, if any, in support thereof should accompany or be embodied in the petition; and where facts are to be proven, the proof in the form of affidavits or declarations (and exhibits, if any) must accompany the petition.

⁽c) When a petition is taken from an action or requirement of an examiner in the ex parte prosecution of an application, or in the ex parte or inter partes prosecution of a reexamination proceeding, it may be required that there have been a proper request for reconsideration (§ 1.111) and a repeated action by the examiner. The examiner may be directed by the Commissioner to furnish a written statement, within a specified time, setting forth the reasons for his or her decision upon the matters averred in the petition, supplying a copy to the petitioner.

⁽d) Where a fee is required for a petition to the Commissioner the appropriate section of this part will so indicate. If any required fee does not accompany the petition, the petition will be dismissed.

⁽e) Oral hearing will not be granted except when considered necessary by the Commissioner.

⁽f) The mere filing of a petition will not stay any period for reply that may be running against the application, nor act as a stay of other proceedings. Any petition under this part not filed within two months of the mailing date of the action or notice from which relief is requested may be dismissed as untimely, except as otherwise provided. This two-month period is not extendable.

⁽g) The Commissioner may delegate to appropriate Patent and Trademark Office officials the determination of petitions. [24 Fed. Reg. 10332, Dec. 22, 1959; 34 Fed. Reg. 18857, Nov. 26, 1969; paras. (d) and (g), 47 Fed. Reg. 41278, Sept. 17, 1982, effective Oct. 1, 1982; para. (a), 49 Fed. Reg. 48416, Dec. 12, 1984, effective Feb. 11, 1985; para. (f) revised, 65 Fed. Reg. 54604, Sept. 8, 2000, effective Nov. 7, 2000; paras. (a) and (c) revised, 65 Fed. Reg. 76756, Dec. 7, 2000, effective Feb. 5, 2001]

the action complained of.

Allegations as Unintentional Delay

Petitioner has failed to satisfy the reply requirement under 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b)—that requirement is a grantable petition under 37 C.F.R. §1.47.

CONCLUSION

Because Petitioner failed to satisfy the regulatory requirements, the petition under 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b) must be and hereby is **dismissed**.

Further correspondence with respect to this matter should be addressed as follows:

By mail:

(Effective 1 May, 2003)⁸

Commissioner for Patents

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

By FAX:

(703) 872-9306 (IFW Formal Filings)

ATTN.: Office of Petitions

By hand:

Customer Service Window

Lobby/Room 1B03 Crystal Plaza Two 2011 South Clark Place Arlington, VA 22202

Telephone inquiries concerning this decision may be directed to the undersigned at (703) 305-

9199.

John J. Gillon, Jr. Senior Attorney Office of Petitions

⁸ To determine the appropriate addresses for other subject-specific correspondence, refer to the USPTO Web site at www.uspto.gov.